



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_10687
Title of the Manuscript:	Computational Basis for Human Relations
Type of the Article	

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. This is an essay paper and not a research paper.</b></li> <li><b>2. Author has a very good knowledge on the issues.</b></li> <li><b>3. In my opinion the author tries to develop a new theory or grounded theory by comparing human relations with scientific reasons</b></li> <li><b>4. However there is no systematic approach used by author to prove this relation.</b></li> <li><b>5. Lack of supporting evidence.</b></li> <li><b>6. No research questions</b></li> <li><b>7. Little or no literature discussed relating to the topic (previous research)</b></li> <li><b>8. Reference dated. (pls refer –(Human Computer Interaction) journal which could help to refine the paper.</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. As far as I know</b> there are no papers that correlate strict scientific methodology with detailed steps within the realm of human behavior.</li> <li><b>2. Thanks!</b> I have been a serious and sincere student of human behavior since my MBA (1978, Economics and Management, after my Ph.D (1962) and D.Sc. (1984, EE) degrees.</li> <li><b>3. Thanks for insight!</b> In fact the paper is to build a bridge into the “Science of Social Programming” for modern computer systems.</li> <li>The Methodology discussed in this paper is a <b>seminal step</b> in being systematic.</li> <li>The supporting evidence lies in the general background of the reader since the Paper <b>refers to the classical works</b> of social scientists, and the CS professionals (see response to #6) .</li> <li>The paper blends the Classic writings of <b>Maslow and Drucker</b> with the algorithmic approaches to Modern Scientific Programming detailed by <b>Knuth and Aho</b>. Their contributions are classics in the field of Computers.</li> <li><b>The prior researchers</b> beat around the bush without being clearly addressing the procedures necessary to be scientific pathway into new discipline.</li> <li>I have refrained from citing second hand references and short changing the Masters of the Discipline. I hope you’ll excuse me for having stuck to the contributions of the original</li> </ol>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b><u>Introduction</u></b></p> <p>Styles, traumas, whims and fancies are generally transient but the social fabric of most cultures has a longer life. Being alive and well founded in the needs of all humans, it changes gradually and continuously, (source..) but it is governed by the social norms and ethics. Having a deep foundation in being congenial, benevolent they are adaptive to changing whims and fancies do not stray too far, nor too long to become outcast destructive to humankind. (Source...)?</p> <p><b>2. CHANGES IN HUMAN NATURE</b></p> <p>The age gap in the populations of many Internet users gets reflected as the use -of-knowledge gap between the two groups. Knowledge gap affirms the natural-behavior gap; and knowledge acquisition over the Internet and knowledge retention of in young minds is a strong component separating the two groups of users. (source...)</p> <p>The final state of human nature is generally a compromise based on gratification of needs that are essential for survival and existence and the acceptable means to gratify such needs. No need is entirely gratified over a long time. In the short run, hu man needs that are all too prevalent to be ignored. In turn, they dictate the behavior and subsequently, the traits of individuals. In fact, human needs provide the energy to gratify the most dominant needs first. They also tend to modify the nature to enact the changes as a routine matter with minimal expenditure of energy. (source...)</p>	<p>contributors.</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Added</p>
--	--	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	<p><b>3. GOAL SEEKING BEHAVIOR IN NATURE</b></p> <p>When the evolution of certain species (like crocodiles), becomes stagnant the skill, knowledge, or retention becomes genetic, and the newborn infants in the species “know” how to “behave” in gratifying their needs. In essence needs, knowledge and gratification become inherently intertwined. (source...)</p> <p><b>4. REWARDS AND SATISFACTION</b></p> <p><b>All the equations must be explained from the source. If self-developed explain how this equation tested in terms of validity and reliability</b></p> <p>Human nature tends to cumulate pertinent knowledge since need(s) are all too prevalent and solution become essential just to survive. (source...)</p> <p>Marginal Utility – must explain in detail because the marginal utility of a human will diminish after certain level.</p>	<p>Added</p> <p>Added</p> <p>Explained. The nature of equation for MU represented as <math>u</math>, reflects this property. Also Explained.</p>
--	---	--



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract does not reflect the whole aim of the study, must improve by interplay with the variables of the research concern.</li> <li>2. Diagrams complicated.</li> <li>3. The source for Equations not stated.</li> </ol>	<p>Modified</p> <p>Human behavior is complicated!</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Very good essay (not research paper). The author may improve it by following qualitative research procedure to establish his/her idea.</li> <li>2. Most of the claims not supported by evidence. This is major error in any research article.</li> <li>3. The presentation format not suitable for this type of research.</li> <li>4. Try to get help experts in the field of research methodology to fine tune the article.</li> <li>5. Provide literature based on your research.</li> <li>6. <b>Highly recommend to publish as proposal.</b></li> <li>7. <b>Include latest reference.</b></li> <li>8. <b>Book – Creswell (2014)</b></li> </ol>	<p>These are subjective comments.</p> <p>Now supplemented by added References</p> <p>Very few experts in this new and seminal field</p> <p>Included Included</p>